

sideration the fact that they are parts of America, and I am referring to both labor and management when I say that.

I have here a communication from one who is opposed to the particular bill now pending. The letter is from Philadelphia, and the writer says:

This bill, or any bill resembling it (including the Norton-Ellender bill, S. 1661), is a vicious attack on the rights of labor. It is undemocratic in its provisions, and will deprive labor of the rights guaranteed to it by the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

I do not think anyone denies that that is the dream of those who have conceived this attack. I wish to say that this letter was not written with reference to the coal strike. Its date was February 28, 1946, before the coal strike had begun. The man who wrote the first letter and the one who wrote the second were discussing labor questions without regard to the coal strike.

Here is another one, dated February 13, 1946. This man is from Connecticut, and, as I remember, is very much of a partisan on the question we are considering. He says:

Prior to the Wagner Labor Relations Act we did not have such situations, nor did we have strikes of the intensity we are having today. The Wagner Act has created an unequal standing between labor and management in the eyes of the law. The same act has tended to throw the control of the actions of labor into the hands of a very few people (labor leaders), who are placed in the position of being protected by law.

Mr. President, one of my earliest recollections of labor difficulties was of those which occurred in the State of Colorado. I believe that State had a Governor who was called "Bloody Briddles" Waite. I remember the bloodshed that resulted from those strikes. I remember that there was a Governor of Illinois by the name of Altgeld, and I remember the coal strike in Illinois, and the destruction of life and property that resulted there. The writer says we did not have anything of such intensity before the Wagner Labor Relations Act. I do not know; but situations were intense enough so that men killed each other at that time.

I remember when a coal commission was appointed, of which Judge Gray from the State of Delaware was made the chairman. I remember the great discussion which took place throughout the land at that time concerning the difficulties arising in connection with the mining of coal.

I have a telegram from Washington, D. C., which I shall read:

We suggest that inasmuch as the Federal Government heretofore found it necessary to enact legislation involving labor matters and enacted the Wagner Act, and in many other instances has undertaken to exercise control over interstate commerce—

Mr. President, I never thought anyone doubted the right of Congress to legislate with respect to interstate commerce. The one who sent the telegram apparently thinks the Federal Government is a sort of interloper when it enacts legislation respecting interstate commerce. He further says:

It is now incumbent upon Congress to accept further responsibility in this field and

enact legislation along the lines of the Case bill designed to put a stop to violence, prevent secondary boycotts, and make contracts binding on those who sign them.

Mr. President, if he can put all that into one dose of medicine he will be a great doctor indeed. That man is going to try to prevent strikes and prevent violence. If there is a State in the Union that has no way either of preventing or of punishing violence, I have not heard of it. But the sender of the telegram is not from any State. He is from Washington, D. C. I think perhaps in the District of Columbia there is some provision of law against violence. Then he is going to prevent secondary boycotts and he is going to make contracts binding on those who sign them. I have seen contracts which were binding, and I have seen contracts which the parties to them ignored. In my State, regardless of whether the Case bill is passed, one can sue an unincorporated association transacting business under a common name. I am informed that one can so sue in a great many other States.

Here is a telegram from my own State:

Brotherhood of Painters No. — ask you to use your influence and vote against anti-labor bill.

The number of the bill is given. The sender recognizes it to be and calls it an anti-labor bill. I find that all those who oppose the so-called Case bill speak of it as anti-labor. I find in my correspondence that a very large percentage of those who favor the bill say, like some gentlemen I have heard, that they want to break down the labor unions.

Mr. President, I have a letter from my own State also that was sent on February 27. The writer has a real constructive suggestion. He says:

After watching the behavior of the United States Senate toward the labor bills now before it—the Case bill and the bill to curb James C. Petrillo—I have come to the conclusion that it is just plain craven, that it cringes every time organized labor says "boo."

Perhaps it ought to be reconstituted, revitalized with new blood of the kind that makes up the House, which has certainly done its plain duty in the case of both of these measures.

I replied as follows:

I am heartily in agreement with your suggestion that the United States Senate should have new blood. I am not sure but what this could easily result in an improvement in many States.

I did not say as to my own State. He had addressed this letter to me.

We find that the people are really sincere. Here is a letter, dated February 11, from a citizen of Delaware:

I am a citizen of Delaware who has just come back from the service into civilian life, and as such am fighting for fair wages and living conditions. The Case bill has points against those principles. Please do everything in your power to see that such a thing does not happen to a free living people.

Also in February—I mention the dates because they show that this was before people were angered at John L. Lewis—I received this letter from a resident of New Jersey:

Therefore, I am sympathetic with the aim of the Case bill to outlaw violence in picketing. Whether court injunctions are the right

way to attain this aim I don't know. It would seem preferable to me to spell out in some detail, right in the bill, what constitutes illegal picketing, rather than leave so much to the interpretation of the courts. Injunctions are likely to be regarded by labor unions as the arbitrary whims of reactionary individuals, whereas Federal laws embody the judgment of some 500 elected Representatives of all the people, and therefore tend to receive more respect. Furthermore, it ought to be possible to find other penalties for violent picketing than the loss of bargaining rights now specified in the Case bill. This kind of punishment strikes dangerously close to fundamental liberties and would tend to make martyrs of violators. The important thing is to make clear what kind of picketing is illegal and who is responsible for enforcing the law in this regard.

So far as I know, this man is not a lawyer; and yet when he says, "This kind of punishment strikes dangerously close to fundamental liberties," he is expressing an idea which no lawyer could improve upon. That is the reason why what the Case bill seeks to accomplish cannot be effectively done, and he realizes it. He has intelligence enough to see through it. He says that it strikes dangerously close to the fundamental liberties of the people.

No matter how much we may condemn any particular person, whether it be Petrillo or Lewis, or some other person who has aroused the antagonism of the American people, it is very difficult to infringe upon the liberty of one individual by an anti-labor bill. That is the very basis of the opposition of millions of people to acts which, so far as their words go, would accomplish what certain people are demanding be done. They want a law to stop this strike. At that time there was no strike by Mr. Lewis and his members.

Some time ago I was interested in the anti-Petrillo bill. I was a member of the committee which took testimony in the matter, including the testimony of Mr. Petrillo himself. I was appointed as chairman of a subcommittee to pass on the bill, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with reference to the Petrillo episode. I myself introduced a bill having for its purpose the same objective as that of the Vandenberg bill. Later I was a member of the committee which handled the Vandenberg bill, and was as helpful as I could be toward its passage. So I could tell this man, if I desired to start up the correspondence again, that I was not particularly favorable to the tactics of Mr. Petrillo.

Here is a letter from California. The writer says:

How long are we, the American people, going to stand for this CIO anarchy, to allow less than 10 percent of the population to kick the rest of us around? I am hoping that you Senators will have guts—

I do not know what he means with respect to the CIO. Mr. Lewis has passed on from the CIO.

Here is a letter from New Jersey. The writer says:

Management's right to manage its property free from union domination of its supervisory forces is to be safeguarded.

He is referring to a measure which has not yet been introduced. This afternoon

the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] told us that that amendment had not been offered.

Here is a letter from my home State which gives a rather startling view of the law. The writer says:

In order to clear up several points in my letter of February 15 in regard to the stand taken by the Delaware State Farm Bureau in asking for your support of the Case bill and Hobbs bill, I would like to state that at the present time labor unions, through a Supreme Court ruling, are exempt by law of any acts of violence, intimidation, or boycotting.

He says that labor unions are exempt by law because of a Supreme Court ruling. I sent him a quotation from the decision written by Justice Byrnes in the case of United States against Local 807, and asked him to let me know of anything that contradicted that quotation. Justice Byrnes stated, in the decision to which he was referring:

The use of violence disclosed by this record is plainly subject to the ordinary criminal law.

Not only did he not say that there was excuse for the crime, but he said that it was subject to the punishment of the ordinary criminal law. But people over the country have the idea that there is an absolute clearance of all crime, just so long as it is committed by a labor union or some member of a labor union. I do not know who is responsible for that idea. It may be the National Association of Manufacturers. Perhaps it is the chambers of commerce. Sometimes they have sent out things which sounded pretty queer.

Here is a telegram from my home State:

Delaware State Federation of Labor very much opposed to Congressman Case's bill, known as H. R. 5262. We ask you to oppose and vote against its adoption.

Of course, one may say that that is from a labor union. The other day a man wrote me that I was representing a certain labor union, naming it. I wrote back and asked him if he thought that people who were members of labor unions were entitled to be represented by their Senators and Representatives in Congress, or whether he believed that Senators and Representatives should confine their representation to other classes than those who belonged to labor unions. He has not yet answered my inquiry. And yet that statement was from a man who is well educated, and who conducts a large business. He says in effect that if we represent labor unions, or if we represent people who are members of labor unions, we are doing something wrong. I feel that it is my duty to represent not only labor unions, but members of the employment branch of industry. I do not intend to do something which I think will injure either of those elements. If there is to be any injury I want it to be the very least possible under the circumstances.

Here is a letter from Pennsylvania. The writer says:

The present curtailment of our country's production of goods and services is due primarily to some irresponsible and greedy labor leaders who are using their present power to

gain more power, at the sacrifice of both labor and the American public.

I cannot answer him, because I do not know what the difficulty is. I can only say, as I have said, that Mr. Lewis is not taking the American people into his confidence. He is not giving us an opportunity to judge whether he is right or wrong. In my opinion he is injuring the cause of labor. By his attitude he is threatening to pull down the great temple of labor legislation which has been built up in America for more than 30 years. That is a danger not alone to labor, but to the American people; and we feel the effects of the first onslaught when a strike is declared.

But let us understand that the great question of the relationship between labor and capital is not going to be determined by one law. It is not going to be determined by one strike. It is going to be determined by the common sense of the American people over a long period. In my opinion the American people do not wish to destroy either labor or management.

Again, in February, long before the last coal strike, I received a letter which contained this statement:

The news from the important centers such as New York City, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh makes it evident that the control of the United States is passing out of the hands of the Federal Government and the State governments into the leaders of militant labor organizations.

I do not believe that such a statement can truthfully be made. I do not think anything of that sort can truthfully be said. The Governor of Pennsylvania sent State police into the Pittsburgh area to control those who were striking. That action was taken because of violence or threatened violence. I think the writer of the letter is without reason for the statements he has made in it. I believe Pennsylvania is able to handle its own affairs, and I think it did so.

Here is another letter from Pittsburgh, written in February:

In my judgment, that is what the Case bill is endeavoring to do. It is not perfect by a long shot, but, as I stated in my letter to you of February 19, it is a step in the right direction and may bring about industrial peace.

He says it may do so. He does not have much confidence in it, and I do not think anyone else has. I do not think many of the people who are responsible for this great antilabor movement all over the country actually believe that passage of this bill would put an end to strikes.

The other day I noticed that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, challenged any Member of the Senate to show how there would be one more ton of coal mined or anything else produced by reason of the passage of this antilabor bill. The Senator from Kentucky did not call it an antilabor bill; I am calling it that. No Senator has responded to that challenge, so far as I have heard.

I now read from a letter which I received from a person in Massachusetts:

As a means of maintaining a more even balance that assures both sides the oppor-

tunity to properly arbitrate and eliminate such conditions as we have today in many industries I believe that the Case antistrike bill should be passed.

Evidently many of the people who write such letters have never read the Case antistrike bill. They are opposed to strikes, just as all the rest of us are; we wish that there were no cause for strikes; we wish that strikes could be replaced by agreements.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator from Delaware has just made a statement about which I should like to make a brief comment. I wish to say that the person who wrote him that letter about the Case bill probably never had read the Case bill and probably knew very little about it. I think that 95 percent of the mail which the Senator from Illinois receives, advising him to do something one way or another in regard to certain matters, may be classified or characterized in the same way that the Senator from Delaware has classified or characterized the correspondence to which he has been referring. In other words, time after time in replying to letters which I have received from constituents in Illinois, I have asked them to state definitely their reasons or to give me a bill of particulars as to why they favor or oppose the enactment of a certain measure. I doubt that I receive more than 1 answer for every 200 letters of that sort which I write in reply.

The radio commentators and the newspapers are constantly asking people to write to their Senators or their Representatives about this or that issue. As a result of that type of propaganda, at the present time my mail is so large that I am unable to answer it. Yet when we reply to such letters from our constituents and ask them to give us some constructive information in regard to the measure to which they refer or to give us detailed reasons why they favor or oppose its passage, 99 out of 100 will never answer that sort of reply.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I simply am saying—and I say this with all due respect, because under the Constitution every citizen has a right to petition his Senator or Representative in regard to what he thinks should or should not be done—that sooner or later our constituents will learn that the form propaganda which comes to our offices day after day simply does not mean a thing, so far as I am concerned.

At this particular moment I have on my desk a stack of postal cards, at least 2 feet high, by which the breweries or some persons who are interested in the making of beer now are asking me to intercede with the OPA in order to keep the breweries in operation, and they have used a card which has my name printed on one side, and on the back there is printed a lot of propaganda, so that all the sender has to do is sign it. I expect